UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,543	02/20/2004	Stephen Cutler	CUTCP0103US	7433

23908   7590   07/07/2010
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP
1621 EUCLID AVENUE
NINETEENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER
ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/07/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2010*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-14,16-28,35-46,48-50,52-64 and 71-92* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-14,16-28,35-46,48-50,52-64 and 71-92* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/27/2010 has been entered.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 4/27/2010.

2.   Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64 and 71-92 are pending in the case.

3.   Claims 11, 15, 29-34, 47, 51 and 65-70 are cancelled.

4.   Claims 75-92 are newly added.

5.   Claims 1, 37, 75, 77, 79 and 86 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's response dated 4/27/2010, applicant has amended the following:

a) Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 16-18, 21-24, 26, 37-39, 41, 42, 44, 48, 49, 52-54, 57-60 and 62.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26, 35-46, 48-50, 52-55, 57-60, 62, 71-74, 79,

80, 82-85-87 and 89-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Dauerer et al. ("Dauerer"), Patent No. 5,841,435.

Claim 1:

Dauerer teaches a virtual display and a virtual windows desktop system (see

abstract) **(claim 1; i.e., a computer-readable medium storing a computer**

application workspace generation and navigation tool that comprises:) Examiner

interprets the virtual display to be the recited application workspace. Examiner interprets

the virtual windows desktop system to be capable of functioning as a navigation tool

(see col. 7 lines 19-42).

Dauerer teaches **computer code within a main computer application that**

generates a continuous logical main application workspace that is larger in size

than a physically viewable operating system desktop work area displayed on a

physical computer system display, the continuous logical main application

workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screen areas (see abstract, col. 4

lines 38-43, Figure 3)

Dauerer teaches **each logical screen has predetermined dimensions that are coextensive with the physically viewable work area on the physical computer system display such that each logical screen has dimensions that are the same as every other logical screen;** (see abstract, col. 2 lines 28-33, Figure 3)

Dauerer teaches that **the logical screens are arranged contiguously in predetermined locations in the logical main application workspace such that the logical main application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace that is larger in size than the physical computer system display used to display the physically viewable work area; each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace; and computer code that moves, by user action, the logical main application workspace from an area displaying a currently displayed one of the logical screens in the physically viewable work area, the selected area of one of the logical screens being any user selected screen area in the logical main application workspace** (see abstract, col. 7 lines 29-41: "Discreet Physical Display Movement function", Figure 3).

Claim 2:

Dauerer teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical screens of within the logical main application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one open sub-application** (see col. 2 lines 23-26, col. 4 lines 33-35).

Claim 3:

Dauerer teaches anchoring an application object and dynamically sizing the

virtual display (see col. 4 lines 63-67, col. 5 lines 35-40) **(claim 3; i.e., code that**

increases the number of logical screens when, by user action, one of the sub-

application windows is moved to a new location outside the current dimensions

of the continuous logical main application workspace.) Examiner interprets having

an anchored application object (e.g. application window), while dynamically sizing the

virtual display with a mouse as taught by Dauerer anticipates the recited claim 3.

Claim 4:

Dauerer teaches configuring the virtual display to any size (see col. 2 lines 41-

45). **(claim 4; i.e., code that increases the number of logical screens add logical**

screens in a number that is in excess of that needed to accommodate the new

location of the sub-application window)

Claim 5:

Dauerer's Figure 3 illustrates **code that logically associates each sub-**

application window location with a logical screen of the continuous main

application workspace in which a majority of the sub-application window is

disposed.

Claim 6:

Dauerer teaches **code that stores an arrangement of sub-application windows locations disposed within the logical main application workspace** (see col. 10 lines 3-13).

Claim 7:

Dauerer teaches **code that retrieves the stored arrangement of sub-application windows** (see col. 10 lines 3-13).

Claim 8:

Dauerer teaches **code that stores a layout of the continuous logical main application workspace including a number and arrangement of logical screens and relative location of each sub-application window within the continuous logical application workspace** (see col. 7 lines 43-51, col. 9 lines 8-10).

Claim 9:

Dauerer teaches **code that retrieves the stored layout** (see col. 7 lines 59-63).

Claim 10:

Dauerer teaches **code that scales the continuous application workspace and sub-application windows to zoom the application workspace in or out** (see col. 5 lines 47-51, Figure 6).

Claim 12:

Dauerer teaches **code that, upon initiation of one of the sub-application windows, logically associates the sub-application window with a logical screen within the continuous logical main application workspace identified by user action** (see col. 2 lines 51-60).

Claim 13:

Dauerer teaches **code to provide the user with a user moveable placement means, wherein the logical screen associated with a sub-application window within the continuous logical main application workspace identified by user action corresponds to a logical screen including location of the placement means relative to the continuous logical main application workspace** (see col. 6 lines 20-29).

Claim 14:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the logical screens are contiguously arranged in a matrix** (see col. 4 lines 40-43, Figure 3).

Claim 16:

Dauerer teaches **code that increases the number of logical screens and a corresponding dimension of the continuous logical main application workspace in accordance with a user action** (see col. 5 lines 40-46).

Claim 17:

Dauerer teaches **code that decreases the number of logical screens and a corresponding dimension of the continuous logical main application workspace in accordance with a user action** (see col. 5 lines 40-46).

Claim 18:

Dauerer teaches **code that generates a navigation box that includes a representation of the continuous logical main application workspace including an indication of each logical screen within the workspace** (see col. 6 lines 20-29). Examiner interprets the reduced virtual display as taught by Dauerer to anticipate the recited navigation box of claim 18.

Claim 19:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the logical screen representations are arranged to have a topography corresponding to a topography of the logical screens** (see col. 6 lines 20-29).

Claim 21:

Dauerer teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations within the continuous logical main application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one sub-application** (see col. 2 lines 23-26, col. 4 lines 33-35).

Claim 22:

Dauerer's Figure 3 illustrates **code that logically associates each sub-application window with a logical screen in which a majority of the sub-application window is disposed and code that displays an iconic representation of each sub-application window in association with the representation of the logically associated screen**.

Claim 23:

Dauerer teaches **code that moves a user selected sub-application window from a logically associated screen to another logical screen in response to user initiated movement of the corresponding iconic representation of the sub-application window in the navigation box** (see col. 9 lines 51-56). Examiner notes that the reduced virtual display as illustrated in Dauerer's Figure 6 may be interpreted as the recited navigation box.

Claim 24:

Dauerer teaches **code that displays information relating to one of the sub-application windows in response to user action in connection with the iconic representation of the one of the sub-application windows in the navigation box application** (see col. 6 lines 30-40; user authorizing display of content of the sub application windows).

Claim 26:

Dauerer teaches **code that generates the logical application workspace generates a plurality of logical application workspaces for the main computer application** (see abstract).

Claim 35:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement pointer having a position that defines the location within the continuous logical workspace identified by user action** (see col. 2 lines 51-60).

Claim 36:

Dauerer teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement tool for marking the location within the logical workspace identified by user action** (see col. 2 lines 51-60).

Claim 73:

Dauerer teaches **code that, in response to a user input, changes the logical screen that is displayed in the physically viewable work area of the computer system display** (see col. 4 lines 44-48, col. 5 lines 63-67, col. 7 lines 25-31)

Claims 37, 38, 41-46, 48-50, 52-55, 57-60, 62, 71, 72 and 74:

Claims 37, 38, 41-46, 48-50, 52-55, 57-60, 62, 71, 72 and 74 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26, 35, 36 and 73 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 1, 2, 5-10, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26, 35, 36 and 73 above.

Claims 75 and 76:

Claims 75 and 76 are substantially encompassed in claims 1, 3 and 4; therefore claims 75 and 76 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1, 3 and 4 above.

Claims 77 and 78:

Claims 77 and 78 are substantially encompassed in claims 1, 3 and 4; therefore
claims 77 and 78 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1, 3 and 4 above.

Claims 79, 80 and 82-85:

Claims 79, 80 and 82-85are substantially encompassed in claims 1, 18, 19 and
21-24; therefore claims 79, 80 and 82-85 are rejected under the same rationale as
claims 1, 18, 19 and 21-24 above.

Claims 86, 87 and 89-92:

Claims 86, 87 and 89-92 are substantially encompassed in claims 1, 18, 19 and
21-24; therefore claims 86, 87 and 89-92 are rejected under the same rationale as
claims 1, 18, 19 and 21-24 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20, 25, 27, 28, 56, 61, 63, 64, 81 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Dauerer as cited above, in view of Anderson of

record.

Claim 20:

Dauerer teaches restoring the virtual display from the reduced virtual display (i.e.,

navigation box) (see col. 10 line 2).

Dauerer fails to expressly teach **in response to user selection of one of the**

screen representations in the navigation box, displays the corresponding screen on

the computer system display in the physically viewable work area defined by the main

computer application (emphasis added).

However, Anderson teaches **code that, in response to user selection of one**

of the screen representations in the navigation box, displays the corresponding

screen on the computer system display in the physically viewable work area

defined by the main computer application (see par. 5-6; Each button 110-116 may

be clicked using a pointing device, such as a mouse, to bring up a virtual desktop

associated with the clicked button.). Examiner interprets a button to represent a reduced

logical screen of a virtual desktop.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was to modify the logical screen of the reduced virtual display as taught by

Dauerer to respond to a mouse click to bring up a virtual desktop as taught by Anderson

to provide the benefit of quickly visiting the virtual desktop once a user has recognize

the desired reduced virtual desktop screen (see Anderson; par. 5-6).

Claim 25:

Anderson illustrates a panel **from which a user can select one of the plurality**

of logical screens for display in the physically viewable work area defined by the

main computer application (see Figure 1C).

Both Dauerer and Anderson fail to expressly teach a drop down menu for

performing the same function.

However, Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art (i.e., computer programmer) at the time the invention was made to

substitute the panel as taught by Anderson with a conventional drop-down menu. In

other words, the drop down menu is merely a design choice chosen by the Applicant

and does not patentably distinguish over the Anderson reference. **(claim 25; code that**

provides a drop down menu from which a user can select one of the plurality of

logical screens for display on the computer system display in the physically

viewable work area defined by the main computer application)

Claim 27:

Dauerer fails to expressly teach each logical screen associated with a unique

identifying feature.

However, Anderson teaches **wherein each logical screen is associated with a unique identifying feature** (see par. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the logical screens of the virtual display as taught by Dauerer to include a unique identifying feature as taught by Anderson to provide the benefit of helping the user distinguish between the plurality of virtual desktop screens (see Anderson; par. 9-10).

Claim 28:

Dauerer fails to expressly teach each logical screen associated with a unique identifying feature.

However, Anderson teaches **wherein the unique identifying feature is selected from a background color, a background pattern and a combination thereof** (see par. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the logical screens of the virtual display as taught by Dauerer to include a unique identifying feature as taught by Anderson to provide the benefit of helping the user distinguish between the plurality of virtual desktop screens (see par. 9-10).

Claims 56, 61, 63 and 64:

Claims 56, 61, 63 and 64 are a method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 20, 25, 27 and 28, respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 20, 25, 27 and 28 above.

Claim 81:

Claim 81 is a claim that is substantially encompassed in claim 20; therefore claim 81 is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 20 above.

Claim 88:

Claim 88 is a claim that is substantially encompassed in claim 20; therefore claim 88 is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 20 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/27/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Dauerer fails to teach or suggest moving the main application workspace from displaying a currently displayed logical screen to displaying

a selected logical screen, the selected logical screen being any screen in the logical

main application workspace as recited in claims 1 and 37 (see Response; page 22).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner notes that Applicant admits that the only navigation mechanism of

Dauerer that is based on a display-sized area is the "Discreet Physical Display

Movement" function, by which a movement equal to one physical display size may be

employed using a pointer in either a vertical or horizontal direction from the current view

(see Dauerer; col. 7 lines 32-42).

Dauerer teaches that the virtual display can be configured to any size and may

be a multiple of physical display or variable size if preferred (see col. 4 lines 38-43). For

example, Examiner submits that the configuration display may be an array size of 1 by

1. In this instance, using the "Discreet Physical Display Movement" function, one

movement equal to one display size in either the vertical or horizontal direction will

move the main application workspace (i.e., virtual display) from displaying a currently

displayed logical screen (i.e., current physical display portion in 1 x 1 array) to

displaying a selected logical screen (i.e., the only other physical display portion in 1 x 1

array), the selected logical screen being any screen in the logical main application

workspace as recited in claims 1 and 37. Thus, in the smallest instance where there is a

plurality of physical display portions (i.e., two physical display portions of the virtual

display), clearly, Dauerer must teach or suggest moving the main application workspace

from displaying a currently displayed logical screen to displaying a selected logical

screen, the selected logical screen being any screen in the logical main application

workspace as recited in claims 1 and 37.

Applicant argues that Dauerer fails to teach or suggest *"associating a plurality*

of sub-application windows with respective logical screens within the logical

main application workspace" as recited in claims 2, 12, 13, 38, 48 and 49 (emphasis

added) (see Response; page 23).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant admits that Dauerer's Figure 3 illustrates a virtual workspace that can

be a multiple of a physical display 54 arranged in an "array", such as a 3x3 array.

Examiner submits that each physical display within the array is an example of a "logical

screen" as recited in the claims. Examiner further submits that Daurer teaches moving

objects anywhere on the virtual display (see abstract). Therefore, when a sub

application is located one of the plurality of physical displays, the sub application is then

associated with that physical display. Thus, Dauerer does teach or suggest

"associating a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical

screens within the logical main application workspace" as recited in claims 2, 12,

13, 38, 48 and 49 (emphasis added).

Applicant argues that an anchored object cannot be moved outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace as claimed (see Response; page 25).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner understands that the anchored object cannot be moved outside the physical display. However, it is the physical display that is moved within the workspace. As noted above, a workspace as taught by Dauerer may comprise of an array of physical display portions. Therefore, when the "current" physical display is moved with the anchored object to a different physical display portion, the anchored object is moved outside the dimensions of the previous "current" physical display. Thus, an anchored object can be moved outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace as claimed.

Applicant argues that Dauerer does not expand the workspace by dragging (or otherwise moving) a sub-application window outside the current workspace dimension (see Response; page 25).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner notes that "the current dimension" is being interpreted to refer back to

the dimension of the logical screen as recited in the independent claims. In other words,

each logical screen has its own dimension that is the same as other logical screens. As

noted above, a workspace as taught by Dauerer may comprise of an array of physical

display portions. Therefore, when the "current" physical display is moved with the

anchored object to a different physical display portion, the anchored object is moved

outside the dimensions of the previous "current" physical display. Thus, an anchored

object can be moved outside the current dimensions of the continuous logical main

application workspace as claimed.

Applicant argues that the reduced virtual display52 of Dauerer does not contain

an indication of each logical screen as claimed (see Response; page 26).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Dauerer teaches visually reducing the **entire** virtual display 52 to create a

reduced version (emphasis added). Examiner submits that everything that is a feature

of the expanded version may also be a feature of the reduced version.

Dauerer further teaches a second mode (i.e., reduced virtual display 52) of

moving the physical display 54 anywhere within the virtual display 52 bounds (see col. 5

lines 47-51). Examiner submits that moving the physical display 54 involves moving to

other physical displays (i.e., logical screens) within the array (see col. 6 lines 1-9) (col. 4

lines 40-43). Therefore, moving the physical display 54 during the reduced version (i.e.,

entire virtual display) as taught by Dauerer does teach or suggest an indication of each

logical screen as claimed.

Applicant argues that Dauerer fails to teach or suggest moving sub-applications

to another logical screen by moving the iconic representation of the sub-application as

recited in the claims (see Response; page 27).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Dauerer teaches moving display objects while displaying the reduced version

(see col. 6 lines 20-29). Therefore, Dauerer does teach or suggest moving sub-

applications to another logical screen by moving the iconic representation of the sub-

application as recited in the claims.

Applicant argues that the reduced virtual display of Dauerer is not a navigation

box displayed in combination with the content of a single displayed screen in the

claimed invention (see Response; page 27).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., a navigation box displayed in combination with the content of a single displayed

screen) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that Dauerer fails to teach or suggest any navigation

mechanism based upon an individual selection of a purported screen anywhere in the

workspace (see Response; page 27).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner notes that Applicant admits that the only navigation mechanism of

Dauerer that is based on a display-sized area is the "Discreet Physical Display

Movement" function, by which a movement equal to one physical display size may be

employed using a pointer in either a vertical or horizontal direction from the current view

(see Dauerer; col. 7 lines 32-42).

Dauerer teaches that the virtual display can be configured to any size and may

be a multiple of physical display or variable size if preferred (see col. 4 lines 38-43). For

example, Examiner submits that the configuration display may be an array size of 1 by

1. In this instance, using the "Discreet Physical Display Movement" function, one

movement equal to one display size in either the vertical or horizontal direction will

move the main application workspace (i.e., virtual display) from displaying a currently

displayed logical screen (i.e., current physical display portion in 1 x 1 array) to

displaying a selected logical screen (i.e., the only other physical display portion in 1 x 1

array), the selected logical screen being any screen in the logical main application

workspace as recited in claims 1 and 37. Thus, in the smallest instance where there is a

plurality of physical display portions (i.e., two physical display portions of the virtual

display), clearly, Dauerer must teach or suggest a navigation mechanism based upon

an individual selection of a purported screen anywhere in the workspace.

Applicant argues that Daurer fails to teach or suggest a drop down menu from

which an individual screen positioned anywhere within the logical application workspace

may be selected for navigation (see Response; page 27).

Examiner notes that Daurer is not relied up upon to teach a drop down menu

from which an individual screen positioned anywhere within the logical application

workspace may be selected for navigation.

Applicant argues that the desktops as taught by Anderson do not form a

contiguous logical workspace and instead are each logically isolated from one another

(see Response; page 28).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Anderson teaches that when application sharing is enabled, an application window that is active in one virtual desktop may be made active in another virtual desktop (see par. 39). Therefore, the virtual desktops may form a contiguous logical workspace and are not always logically isolated from one another.

Applicant remaining arguments with respect to claims are substantially encompassed in the arguments above, therefore examiner responds with the same rationale as stated above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Examiner maintains prior art rejections.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HENRY ORR whose telephone number is (571)270-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L. Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

7/2/2010
HO

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175